

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 and 14-16 are pending. Claims 1-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claims 1-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

**Rejection Under 35 U. S. C. § 112**

Claims 1-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant has responded by amending independent claims 1 and 11.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claims 1-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Noureldin et al., "Computer Modelling of Microelectronic Closed Loop Fiber Optic Gyroscope", 1999 IEEE, May 9-12, 1999.

Applicant has avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"computing, via digital signal processing, one or more performance parameters of a fiber optic gyroscope to determine a relationship between a performance parameter and a physical parameter associated with fiber optic gyroscope components through employment of a closed-loop transfer function based on at least one characteristic of:

one or more optical components of the fiber optic gyroscope; and  
one or more electrical components of the fiber optic gyroscope;  
wherein one of the one or more performance parameters is a closed-loop bandwidth of the fiber optic gyroscope."

Noureldin does not teach this limitation. This is because Noureldin does not disclose a closed-loop bandwidth of the fiber optic gyroscope.

By contrast, applicant's claim 1 recites, "wherein one of the one or more performance parameters is a closed-loop bandwidth of the fiber optic gyroscope." Thus,

Noureldi is missing "a closed-loop bandwidth of the fiber optic gyroscope" elements, as recited in applicant's claim 1.

Thus, the clear teaching of Noureldi is that one of the one or more performance parameters is not a closed-loop bandwidth of the fiber optic gyroscope.

Therefore Noureldin does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in applicant's claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is allowable over Noureldin. Since claims 2-10 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Noureldin.

Independent claim 11 has a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by Noureldin. For example, claim 11 recites, "wherein one of the one or more performance parameters is a closed-loop bandwidth of the fiber optic gyroscope". Noureldin does not teach or suggest this limitation for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claim 11 is likewise allowable over Noureldin. Since claims 12 and 14-15 depend from claim 11, these dependent claims are also allowable over Noureldin.

#### New Claim

New claim 16 was added. Claim 16 provides an additional limitation directed to the closed-loop bandwidth. No new matter was added.

#### Claim Amendments

Claim 14 was amended to provide proper antecedent basis. No new matter was added.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: December 10, 2007

PATTI, HEWITT & AREZINA, LLC  
Customer Number 32205